

Todd R. G. Hill  
119 Vine Street  
Belton, TX 76513  
+1 [661] 899-8899  
toddryangregoryhill@gmail.com  
*In Propria Persona*



**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR  
THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**WESTERN DIVISION**

**TODD R. G. HILL, et al,**

**Plaintiffs**

**vs.**

**THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS,  
OFFICERS AND AGENTS AND  
INDIVIDUALS OF THE PEOPLES  
COLLEGE OF LAW, et al.,**

**Defendants.**

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:23-cv-01298-JLS-BFM**

**The Hon. Josephine L. Staton**  
Courtroom 8A, 8th Floor

**Magistrate Judge Brianna Fuller Mircheff**  
Courtroom 780, 7th Floor

**NOTICE OF PRESERVED RECORD,  
CLARIFICATION OF REDLINE  
REFERENCE, AND PRESERVATION OF  
RIGHTS UNDER RULE 59(e)  
AND RULE 60(b)**

**NO ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED**

---

**NOTICE OF PRESERVED RECORD, CLARIFICATION OF REDLINE REFERENCE, AND PRESERVATION  
OF RIGHTS UNDER RULE 59(e) AND RULE 60(b)**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	PRESERVATION OF PROCEDURAL RECORD AND REFERENCE TO CORRECTED VERSION .....	3
II.	INDEPENDENT RESOLUTION OF RULE 59(E) MOTION AND CONSTRUCTIVE DENIAL OF DISCOVERY .....	4
III.	ANTICIPATED RULINGS AND NEED FOR RECORD CLARITY .....	6
IV.	CONCLUSION .....	7
	STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE WITH LOCAL RULE 11-6.1 .....	7
	Plaintiff's Proof of Service .....	8
 <b>Rules</b>		
	Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e).....	4
	Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) .....	4
	Local Rule 5-4.1 .....	6

---

**NOTICE OF PRESERVED RECORD, CLARIFICATION OF REDLINE REFERENCE, AND PRESERVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER RULE 59(e) AND RULE 60(b)**

**NOTICE OF PRESERVED RECORD, CLARIFICATION OF REDLINE REFERENCE, AND  
PRESERVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER RULE 59(e) AND RULE 60(b)**

TO THE HONORABLE COURT AND ALL PARTIES OF RECORD:

Plaintiff Todd R.G. Hill respectfully submits this consolidated notice to preserve the procedural record and clarify the operative documents and deadlines relevant to the Court's in-chambers order dated May 22, 2025 (Dkt. 311), and in anticipation of any forthcoming rulings concerning the proposed Fifth Amended Complaint (5AC) and related pending motions.

**I. PRESERVATION OF PROCEDURAL RECORD AND REFERENCE TO  
CORRECTED VERSION**

Plaintiff submitted a corrected version of the proposed Fifth Amended Complaint on May 22, 2025, via the Court's Electronic Document Submission System (EDSS Tracking No. EDS-250522-002-0524), together with a signed declaration and a Notice of Errata and Substitution (EDSS Tracking No. EDS-250522-002-0525). On May 23, 2025, Plaintiff submitted a redline comparison between the operative Fourth Amended Complaint and the corrected Fifth Amended Complaint, pursuant to the Court's directive at Dkt. 311 (EDSS Tracking No. EDS-250523-002-0540), along with a formal Notice of Submission of Redline. A supplemental clarification confirming the correct redline reference was also submitted (EDSS Tracking No. EDS-250522-002-0533).

Plaintiff respectfully clarifies that:

- a. The redline reflects the corrected version submitted on May 22, not the earlier working draft docketed at Dkt. 310;
- b. The correction was submitted promptly, with full notice to chambers and all counsel;

---

**NOTICE OF PRESERVED RECORD, CLARIFICATION OF REDLINE REFERENCE, AND PRESERVATION  
OF RIGHTS UNDER RULE 59(e) AND RULE 60(b)**

c. The record now reflects timely notice provision and complete compliance with the Court's order.

For ease of reference, Plaintiff identifies the relevant EDSS filings and associated dates:

Date Submitted	Description	EDSS Tracking No.
May 22, 2025	Corrected Proposed Fifth Amended Complaint	EDS-250522-002-0524
May 22, 2025	Executed Declaration + Notice of Errata	EDS-250522-002-0525
May 23, 2025	Redline Comparison + Notice	EDS-250523-002-0540
May 23, 2025	Supplemental Notice of Redline Reference Version	EDS-250522-002-0533

## **II. INDEPENDENT RESOLUTION OF RULE 59(E) MOTION AND CONSTRUCTIVE DENIAL OF DISCOVERY**

Plaintiff's pending motion to alter or amend judgment under Rule 59(e) remains unresolved. That motion specifically seeks to reopen claims and parties dismissed with prejudice, including those asserted against the State Bar of California and its officials in the Third Amended Complaint (TAC), based on an incomplete and selectively docketed record at the time of dismissal.

Plaintiff respectfully preserves all rights under:

- a. Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e), allowing parties to alter or amend the judgment on grounds of manifest error of law, procedural irregularity, and newly clarified filings;
- b. Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b), applicable should it become necessary to seek relief from judgment based on inadvertence, excusable neglect, or any other reason justifying reconsideration.

---

**NOTICE OF PRESERVED RECORD, CLARIFICATION OF REDLINE REFERENCE, AND PRESERVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER RULE 59(e) AND RULE 60(b)**

1 Plaintiff also incorporates by reference the following filings:

- 2
- 3 1. Docket 298 (filed May 9, 2025): Plaintiff's Request for Judicial Notice and Supplemental
- 4 Brief in Support of Rule 59(e), which provides factual and regulatory support related to
- 5 institutional misconduct and oversight failure;
- 6
- 7 2. Docket 301 (filed May 11, 2025): Plaintiff's Partial Opposition and Judicial Notice
- 8 Submission in response to Defendant Spiro, reinforcing the evidentiary record underpinning
- 9 the regulatory and negligence-based claims in the corrected 5AC;
- 10
- 11 3. Docket 303 (filed May 12, 2025): Plaintiff's Objection and Request to Strike Docket 262 as
- 12 an Unauthorized Post-Dismissal Filing, which challenges further procedural inconsistencies
- 13 and reaffirms Plaintiff's position on the closure of dismissed claims unless formally
- 14 reinstated.
- 15

16

17 Plaintiff respectfully notes that the pendency of the proposed Fifth Amended Complaint does

18 not relieve the Court of its obligation to separately and fully resolve the Rule 59(e) motion, which

19 challenges the integrity of the prior judgment on grounds independent of the present amendment. The

20 issues raised under Rule 59(e) are not mooted by procedural compliance with Dkt. 311 and must be

21 addressed in a distinct ruling or formally preserved for appellate review.

22

23

24 Finally, the continued lack of resolution on the pending Rule 59(e) motion, combined with the

25 delayed docketing and uncertain treatment of Plaintiff's corrected submissions, has resulted in a

26 constructive denial of discovery. This posture preserves significant factual and regulatory

27 asymmetries that, if left unaddressed, risk further material prejudice to the Plaintiff's ability to

28 prosecute his claims on a complete and balanced record. For these reasons, Plaintiff respectfully

---

**NOTICE OF PRESERVED RECORD, CLARIFICATION OF REDLINE REFERENCE, AND PRESERVATION  
OF RIGHTS UNDER RULE 59(e) AND RULE 60(b)**

maintains that the matter should proceed to discovery rather than be resolved through selective evidentiary treatment or narrowed procedural interpretation.

### III. ANTICIPATED RULINGS AND NEED FOR RECORD CLARITY

In anticipation of any ruling on Plaintiff's request for leave to amend, the redline, or the pending Rule 59(e) motion, Plaintiff respectfully confirms that:

- a. The corrected Fifth Amended Complaint, not Dkt. 310, is the intended operative version;
- b. Any ruling that does not engage with the corrected version, or that fails to address the preserved Rule 59(e) motion, will be respectfully treated as incomplete for purposes of future Rule 60(b) relief or appeal;
- c. Plaintiff's filings were timely, procedurally compliant, and served in good faith to facilitate judicial review;
- d. As of the time of this submission, no Defendant has objected to the corrected 5AC, the redline, or the clarification notices, nor raised any claim of prejudice or confusion regarding their sequence or content, despite having received timely notice via courtesy email and document submission in accordance with Local Rule 5-4.1 and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Should the Court issue a ruling on the proposed Fifth Amended Complaint without formally docketing or addressing the corrected version submitted on May 22, 2025, or the redline submitted on May 23, 2025, Plaintiff respectfully submits that such a ruling would materially mischaracterize the procedural record and constitute prejudicial error for purposes of post-judgment relief and appeal.

---

**NOTICE OF PRESERVED RECORD, CLARIFICATION OF REDLINE REFERENCE, AND PRESERVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER RULE 59(e) AND RULE 60(b)**

1 For avoidance of doubt, Plaintiff respectfully reiterates that any ruling predicated on Dkt. 310,  
2 rather than the corrected Fifth Amended Complaint and redline duly submitted via EDSS on May 22  
3 and 23, will be deemed to reflect a misapplication of the procedural record and a failure to evaluate  
4 the operative submission. All objections under Rule 59(e) and 60(b) are preserved, and appellate  
5 rights expressly reserved.  
6

#### 7 8 **IV. CONCLUSION**

9 This notice is submitted to protect the integrity of the record, clarify the basis for forthcoming  
10 rulings, and preserve all rights under applicable rules of procedure. Plaintiff submits this notice in  
11 continued good faith, not to challenge the Court's authority, but to preserve the integrity of the  
12 record, ensure compliance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and assist the Court in  
13 rendering a fully informed and procedurally sound ruling.  
14

15 Respectfully submitted,  
16

17 Dated: May 24, 2025  
18

19  
20   
21

22 **Todd R. G. Hill**  
23 **Plaintiff, In Propria Persona**  
24

#### 25 **STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE WITH LOCAL RULE 11-6.1**

26 The undersigned party certifies that this brief contains 1,005 words, which complies with the 7,000-  
27 word limit of L.R. 11-6.1.  
28

---

**NOTICE OF PRESERVED RECORD, CLARIFICATION OF REDLINE REFERENCE, AND PRESERVATION  
OF RIGHTS UNDER RULE 59(e) AND RULE 60(b)**

1 Respectfully submitted,

2 

3  
4  
5 May 24, 2025

6 Todd R.G. Hill

7 Plaintiff, in Propria Persona

8 **Plaintiff's Proof of Service**

9 This section confirms that all necessary documents will be properly served pursuant to L.R. 5-  
10 3.2.1 Service. This document will be/has been electronically filed. The electronic filing of a  
11 document causes a "Notice of Electronic Filing" ("NEF") to be automatically generated by the  
12 CM/ECF System and sent by e-mail to: (1) all attorneys who have appeared in the case in this Court  
13 and (2) all pro se parties who have been granted leave to file documents electronically in the case  
14 pursuant to L.R. 5-4.1.1 or who have appeared in the case and are registered to receive service  
15 through the CM/ECF System pursuant to L.R. 5-3.2.2. Unless service is governed by Fed. R. Civ. P.  
16 4 or L.R. 79-5.3, service with this electronic NEF will constitute service pursuant to the Federal  
17 Rules of Civil Procedure, and the NEF itself will constitute proof of service for individuals so served.  
18  
19  
20

21 Respectfully submitted,

22 

23  
24  
25 May 24, 2025

26 Todd R.G. Hill

27 Plaintiff, in Propria Persona  
28

---

**NOTICE OF PRESERVED RECORD, CLARIFICATION OF REDLINE REFERENCE, AND PRESERVATION  
OF RIGHTS UNDER RULE 59(e) AND RULE 60(b)**